

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/820,337

**Applicant(s)**

TRIMBERGER, STEPHEN M.

**Examiner**

Brandon W. Bowers

**Art Unit**

2825

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brandon W. Bowers.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Justin Liu.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,12-17 and 20-22.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner Bowers called Attorney Liu to discuss matters to put the case in condition for allowance. Examiners Bowers explained that claims 1 and 17 and the arguments presented with regards to these claims overcame the prior art of record. However claims 20-22 are non-statutory as non-functional descriptive material and that if these claims and the non-elected claims 12-16 are canceled, the case would be in condition for allowance. Attorney Liu agreed to these cancelations .